

REMARKS

This paper is in response to the official action dated January 5, 2007 (the official action). This response is timely filed.

Claims 1-26 are pending. By the foregoing, claims 1, 2, 17, and 24 have been amended to address matters of form. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-26 have been rejected for obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-58 of U.S. Patent No. 7,122,592. Claims 1-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite.

The various bases for the claim rejections are addressed below in the order presented in the official action. Reconsideration of the application is solicited in view of the present amendments and the following remarks.

OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING

Claims 1-26 have been rejected for obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-58 of U.S. Patent No. 7,122,592. The double patenting rejections should be withdrawn because they have been rendered moot by the terminal disclaimer relative to U.S. Patent No. 7,122,592 filed concurrently herewith.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. *See* official action at page 2.

Claims 1, 2, and 24 have been amended to recite “hydrocarbon chain” instead of “alkyl radical.” The applicants respectfully submit that a person of ordinary skill in the art would immediately understand the intended (and obvious) meaning of the limitation as originally filed.

Additionally, claim 17 has been amended to delete the recitation of CAS # 61788-89-4. The applicants respectfully submit that a person of ordinary skill in the art would immediately understand the meaning of the limitation as originally filed, and the meaning of the limitation as amended, particularly in view of the specification.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claims 1-26 were not indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112 because a claim is considered definite as long as “the scope of the

claims is clear so the public is informed of the boundaries of what constitutes infringement of the patent." *See M.P.E.P. §2173.*

Accordingly, the rejections of claims 1-26 for indefiniteness have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the examiner wish to discuss any matter of form or procedure in an effort to advance this application to allowance, he is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

April 5, 2007

Andrew M. Lawrence

Andrew M. Lawrence, Reg. No. 46,130
Attorney for Applicant
6300 Sears Tower
233 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300